

March 6, 1975

become delinquent and they would be charged against the property and the owners of the bonds would take over the property. Am I not right?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Are you asking me . . . that is a question?

SENATOR KEYES: Yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: May I answer him with a question, and it's not to be argumentative. First, so that I understand where we're dealing . . . Senator Keyes, does this bill say anything about whether they should be revenue or general obligation bonds?

SENATOR KEYES: No it does not, but . . .

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Now, should they be general obligation bonds what is pledged to pay off a general obligation bond?

SENATOR KEYES: Just the taxes on the increase in valuation of property is what I hope.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Then you and I don't understand general obligation bonds the same way, so I can't answer your question.

SENATOR KEYES: OK, thank you.

PRESIDENT: Senator Mahoney.

SENATOR MAHONEY: Mr. President, I speak in behalf of opposing Senator Chambers bringing this back. It is curious that the people who have come to the floor today are the ones that have opposed the bill, as far as the votes are concerned. It is in attempt to deprive a metropolitan city of doing something constructive for itself; tearing out an area that should definitely have improvement. This is something that can be controlled. I know that Senator Chambers mentioned well maybe this mayor will be gone in a couple years, which is true, but every mayor that we have had in the past has always worked for some type of improvement in the very decayed areas of our city. I think that Senator Swigart, who has had long experience on the City Council, and who is actually an expert, and has all the expertise, has given you the very point that's most necessary here today. I think it would be a shame that we'd bring this bill back. We should let this go and let the people decide it. What is wrong with letting the people decide this particular issue, to try to improve a river city, a city that has too long been in the area of neglect as far as housing. There would be very little in this area, but at least the commercial area will be able to try to clean itself up. When you, the Senators, come to Omaha you'll be proud to see that there's been rejuvenation, such as Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania and many other cities that I could mention. I think this is a step forward. I think the people should decide it. I think very definitely that this bill should not be brought back.

PRESIDENT: Senator Frank Lewis of Sarpe county.

SENATOR F. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the Chambers motion. To set the record straight, this bill